DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 878 HE 026 575

AUTHOR Karseth, Berit
TITLE The Emergence of a New Educational Program at the University of Oslo.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - General (140) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Curriculum Development; *Departments; *Educational Development; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Organizational Communication; *Politics of Education; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *University of Oslo (Norway)

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the emergence and the establishment of new educational programs in universities by describing a theoretical approach and reporting an empirical study of the development of one interdisciplinary department (the Institute for Media and Communication) at the University of Oslo (Norway). It is argued that the emergence of new educational programs can be understood as a result of the interplay, or discourses, between the internal factors (the knowledge traditions) and the external factors (politics of knowledge), a construction shaped by negotiation between individuals inside and outside the field of knowledge in a specific social and historical setting. The case study involved interviews with 11 faculty members of the Institute, interviews with people not in the department but instrumental in its establishment, and evaluation of relevant written material. Results are interpreted in terms of the arguments behind the emergence of the Institute including: the debates and introduction of media as a school topic; the organization of media and public policy; and arguments and motives of persons within the University. The development of a fully integrated curriculum and the Institute's final location within the Faculty of the Arts are recounted. (Contains 44 references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359878

THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Berit Karseth
University of Oslo[1]

Paper (draft version) for Presentation:
American Educational Research Association
Annual Conference
Atlanta, Georgia
April 1993

HE026 575

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Berit Karseth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

[1] Author's address: Institute for Educational Research, University of Oslo, Box 1092, Blindern, 0317 OSLO, Norway

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OSLO[1]

INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses the emergence and the establishment of new educational programs[2] in the universities. I will start by offering a theoretical approach for studying the emergence of new educational programs in higher education more in a general sense. Second, I will present an empirical study where the data are derived from one department at the University of Oslo in Norway[3] : Institute for Media and Communication[4] . Lastly, I will provide some concluding remarks based on the relationship between the theoretical approach and the empirical study.

Two main research questions are being raised in this paper:

1. How can we explain the development of new educational programs?
2. How can we describe the interplay and the relationship between different factors and arguments that influence the processes behind new educational programs?

My general line of argument is that the emergence of new educational programs can be understood as a result of the interplay between internal factors (the knowledge traditions) and external factors (politics of knowledge). This requires a search for arguments that are rooted both in a discourse where the epistemological arguments about the knowledge production itself are in focus, and in a discourse where strategic and political arguments are in focus.

THEORETICAL APPROACH

The literature on the development of knowledge in higher education is, by and large written with focus on the advancement of knowledge and scientific work (Biglan 1973; Kuhn 1970; Withley 1984; Becher 1989). The main discussion has been whether one can explain the development of knowledge by internal or external factors. A discussion that culminated after Thomas Kuhn's book about the scientific revolution (Lakatos and Musgrave 1970). Alongside the internal/external or as a part of it, is the discussion about macro and micro approaches. Together these dichotomies point to how we understand the nature of knowledge and the role of the intellectuals. From different perspectives researchers have argued that we must overcome these dichotomies (Wagner and Wittrock 1991; Bernstein 1983) or find ways to bridge them (Brante 1981). Differences in disciplinary cultures have to do both with differences between scientific fields and differences between contexts in which the disciplines operate (Smeby 1992:2). This will also be the case for the development of new fields.

A well known study about disciplinary cultures is Tony Becher's study (1989). He describes the differences between disciplines according to both a cognitive and a social dimension. Still, one can argue that in his perspective the epistemological characteristics of the domains of knowledge (the cognitive dimension) are seen as the causes of the disciplinary cultures where the wider social context and institutional context are treated more as subsidiary variables (Huber 1990; Tierney 1991). Following Becher's perspective, but looking at new fields, is Thomas Brante's study of the development of social work in Sweden (1987). When looking at the establishment of new fields of research he distinguishes between a cognitive legitimation, where the strategy for legitimation serves to indicate specifics of the new discipline and its relation to other disciplines, and a social legitimation where the strategy serves to argue for and display its practical utility. A third example is Sven Eric Liedman and Lennart Ollauson (1988) who try to explain the scientific development by looking at the application or use of both research and education. They find three different uses: material use (increase the material production in the society), administrative use (change and improve political and administrative techniques

and processes) and ideological use (to sustain or change our understanding about society, mankind, history, God etc.). When the administrative and material types of use are predominant, the development of the education and research profile supports a specialization of the scientific knowledge. A development where the ideological use is dominating, supports an integration of scientific knowledge. In a historical perspective development of new fields of knowledge in this century can be seen more as a process of specialization and fragmentation than integration (Liedman and Olausson 1987). The connection between education and labour has played an important role in this.

The three examples presented above represent different perspectives, and we may conclude that when moving from Becher through Brante to Liedman and Ollausen the relevance or importance of the social dimension or external factors is strengthened. All these perspectives make an important contribution to understanding the development of new fields of knowledge.

The examples are primarily concerned with the scientific work in disciplines with the exception of Lidman and Olausson (1987, 1988). When looking especially at historical studies on how different subjects or disciplines have developed, we can see that the need for qualified people for the labour marked and the different professions, has played an important role besides advancement of knowledge. Education is the most significant tool for raising the level of qualifications. This is pointed out by Peter Wagner and Björn Wittrock:

> But quite often the cognitive development of the social sciences can hardly be understood apart from its linkages to educational and professional practices. The usual, disciplinary, histories of the social sciences have often misinterpreted the development by looking at the disciplines purely as programmes for the advancement of knowledge. In some cases, as the one just mentioned, scientific advance was not even the major objective. Even where it was, this orientation was often significantly modified by a parallel orientation to training and education purpose. (Wagner and Wittrock, 1990, p. 338).

When moving the focus from research or scientific work to study education and curriculum there is an important difference. Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1988) points out that academic disciplines and the knowledge they produce are not stable, but still the disciplines have traditions and legacies. The academic disciplines are in the long run fictional, but in the short run (the length of an average professional career), they are stable. Curriculum does not have such stability. The field of curriculum or curriculum problems is shifting and is more closely coupled to political events (p. 148-149).

Thus, one way to try to describe the interplay between different types of arguments and processes in developing educational programs is to look at the curriculum.
When viewing curriculum as a social and cultural construction (Gumport 1988; Goodson 1990; Tierney 1989), the content of the curriculum is not a fixed, stable body of knowledge nor is it a logical consequence of the discipline. Rather the curriculum must be seen as Patricia Gumport describes it:

> Similarly, curricula may be seen as that part of the cultural life of academic organizations in which faculty, administrators, and students construct and revise their understanding and in which they negotiate about what counts as valid knowledge in particular historical and social settings. (Gumport 1988, p. 52).

This perspective emphasizes the importance of the historical and social context in the production of knowledge. Knowledge is bounded in a cultural context. The concept of context stresses the importance of both looking at the individuals who are dealing with the production of knowledge (faculty members, students, administrators) and the structures that influence the actors' way of behaving (power structures and knowledge structures). The way knowledge is organized, produced, disturbed and legitimated is related to status, resources and power (Böhme 1986; Goodson 1984; Foucault 1979, 1980; Popkewitz 1992; Rhoades and Slaughter 1991; Silva and Slaughter 1984). Differences between types of knowledge will be mirrored in social differences between their careers (Böhme 1986, p. 57). When new educational programs are established, the power/knowledge relationship changes. As a consequence, a new organization, a department will play an important role in the question about what is the "right" knowledge in the field, and if there are few

competitors, the department will have a great deal of power and control over such knowledge. This control and power are expressed, for instance, through exams and by appointments to new positions. An educational program in this sense can be shown to function as power-knowledge practices - and not just as knowledge practices (Jones 1990).

It is necessary to stress the important links between the field of knowledge and wider society. According to Edward T. Silva and Sheila A. Slaughter:

> Worlds of experts depend on the establishment of knowledge monopolies. A specialized division of expert labour implies that each occupational niche creates and maintains its own knowledge boundaries, defining currently correct ideas and their practical application. But creating and maintaining such boundaries requires a continuing capacity to mobilize material and social resources from the community-at-large. It requires social power. (Silva and Slaughter 1984, p.3)

As Gumport argues, negotiations about the curriculum embrace discussions about what counts as valid knowledge and topics in the different disciplines. Rather than viewing disciplines or subjects as monolithic entities, subjects should be seen as "a set of segments, or social movements, with distinctive missions, or perspectives and material interests" (Cooper 1984, p. 60). This indicates that most disciplines can be understood as representing different subgroups with relationship to different groups outside and inside the higher education institution. Still, with reference to Pierre Bourdieu, a department can be viewed as belonging to an academic discipline and to the academic field (Bourdieu 1988). He claims that it is a field if it is relatively autonomous, which means that the field sets its own standards. Donald Broady (1987) made an attempt to use this concept in a Swedish context. In Broady's perspective the borderline between the participants inside a field and in other fields is important for separating the knowledge of the group inside from knowledge of groups outside. The borderline is necessary for the struggle between the participants inside the field. People are struggling about something they are sharing. The borderline establishes a relatively autonomous field within which the group is able to compete. This may be a fruitful explanation for why we often see the subjects as monological entities because they have some borderlines established. The struggle inside is most clearly expound in examinations and in connection with appointment to new

positions (see Thomas Brante's study of Social Work (1987)). About examinations Ivor Goodson points out:

> The conflict over the status of examinable knowledge therefore becomes the crucial conflict arena where the subject coalitions (and their representative associations) contest the right to material resources and career prospects. (Goodson, 1984, p. 43).

From the research findings presented above, I will outline a perspective on how we can understand and scrutinize the emergence of new educational programs.

In trying to examine the different arguments that actors use in trying to assert the need for a new educational program it is necessary to focus both on internal factors and the cognitive legitimation and external factors and the social legitimation. I will argue that these two together make the discourse that we have to look into for studying new educational programs. Analytically we may divide this discourse into two.

There is an epistemological discourse which denotes the internal factors or the cognitive dimensions. It is the discourse about the knowledge structures, the theoretical concepts, the methodological approaches, and the paradigm.

Another discourse is the political discourse which denotes the more external factors or the social dimension. It is the discourse which includes arguments concerned external factors as for instance: the economical and social situation, the societal needs, the labour market and the need for qualified personnel, the processes of professionalization, the resources accessible to the researchers and the career possibilities. In other words, such factors develop and shape a discourse of strategic and political arguments.

These two types of discourses include different arguments for the production of knowledge. For instance, a faculty member both in discussions with colleagues and in writing will take part in the development of the epistemology of the field, of the knowledge traditions or of the paradigm. On the other hand, the faculty member as a member of a university and a department, will take part in negotiations about how to use

the money, how to get acceptance for new programs and what the department should give preference to in their research and education. The distinction between a political discourse and an epistemological discourse is as stated above, analytical. In real negotiations, arguments of both types will be advocated at the same time. In the presentation of my data I will try to follow these two types of arguments and see how they affect each other.

Before summing up the theoretical part of the paper, I will stress some of the statements from the curriculum research mentioned above.

First, by choosing a curriculum perspective the focus is on education i. e. the educational task of the academic discipline and the department, is the core for the study.

Second, the curriculum theory refered to stresses the notion that knowledge in higher education is a social and a political construction where actors and groups of actors inside and outside the academic discipline negotiate about the content, the access to the program and the form and structure of the educational program. The curriculum is therefore not only guidelines for teaching. The curriculum is also a form of social regulation.

Third, following Goodson's work (1984, 1988) when trying to explain the processes behind a new educational program at the university level, we have to look at the close connection between academic status and resource allocation. Goodson shows how a subject increase its status when established as an academic discipline. Furthermore, he shows how the establishment influences the careers patterns and material resources.

Lastly, the curriculum theory above points to the necessity of viewing the relationship between power and knowledge as mutual. In the establishment of a new educational program a new setting for evaluating knowledge has been shaped. A new group of actors has power to decide what counts as knowledge in a specific field, though, their validation is dependent on power structures and knowledge structures in a broader national and international context.

To sum up the theoretical approach underlying this study, knowledge and curriculum can be seen as a social and a political construction - a construction which is shaped by negotiation between individuals inside and outside the field of knowledge in a specific social and historical setting. In trying to understand the arguments for the establishment of new programs and the direction for their development it is important to look both for arguments of a more political character and arguments that are based more on the rules for scientific work (internal) founded on an epistemological discourse.

METHODS

The data gathered for this paper are interviews with faculty members at a relatively new department under the University of Oslo: The Institute for Media and Communication (IMK). The interviews took place in the autumn of 1991. I interviewed all the tenured faculty staff and most of the research fellows, for a total of 11 interviews, averaging about 1 1/2 hours. All interviews were taped. Since the department is small it is difficult to ensure anonymity, so I decided to send the transcriptions back to the respondents for comments and clarifications. The interviews were structured around four themes: the history of the department, the field of knowledge, the curriculum and educational program, and the culture of the department.

One year later, I gathered data from interviews with people who were not working in the department but who had been key figures in its establishment (at that time Deans of the Faculty of Arts and at the Faculty of Social Sciences plus a person from the central administration). Third, data were gathered from written material on four different levels: societal/political level, i.e. reports to the Storting (the Norwegian National Assembly), reports and recommendations from committees appointed by the Government, journals from teacher unions and teacher organizations; institutional level, i.e. the University, the level of the Faculties as well as the departmental level. The materials are curriculum guidelines, recommendations, reports from meetings and letters.

The presentation of the data in this paper is structured by the following questions:
1. What are the main reasons for the establishment of the new educational program?
2. What are seen as the main conflicts and problems for the establishment and what solutions have been worked out?

Before presenting the data I will give some brief information about the department. The Institute for Media and Communication (IMK) was established in 1987 as an interdisciplinary department. It started teaching a foundation course[5] ("grunnfag", 1 year) in the spring term of 1988 and gave the first intermediate course ("mellomfagstillegget, 1/2 year) the following term. Courses at the master level ("hovedfag", 2 years) started in the spring term of 1989. What is still lacking is an educational program for the Ph.D. level (Fall 1992). Until 1992 the responsibility for the educational program was shared equally by the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences. From January 1, 1992 IMK has been a part of the Faculty of Arts alone.

The theoretical aspects of the subject is taught under the following topics: 1) forms of communication, 2) the history of media, 3) media and society, 4) media institutions, 5) mass communication methods, and 6) the media audience (Faculty of Social Sciences, 1991).

Since 1958 an Institute for Press Research has existed at the University of Oslo as part of the Faculty of Social Sciences. Until 1982 it was predominantly a research institute, though it played an important role in advising master and post-graduate students from other departments and recruited them as research assistants.

Nevertheless, in 1982 this was changed and the Institute for Press Research started to teach a foundation course in Mass Communication and in 1986 it also provided a intermediate course.

THE ARGUMENTS BEHIND THE EMERGENCE OF THE INSTITUTE FOR MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION

In trying to explain the main reasons for the establishment of the new educational program I will present the different arguments supplied by my data. I will start by looking at the need for education in media and communication more generally and two sources will be examined: the need for education for teaching young people how to cope with the different media, and the need for education and knowledge to handle the technological and organizational questions related to the new media situation. After this more general focus I will move on to the arguments used from actors inside the university.

I have chosen the end of the 1970s as a starting point. Even if the incentives go back much longer, at this point in time the discussion was emphasized due to the new possibilities in media (cable television, satellite), and to the increased accessibility to technology.

The debates and introduction of media as a school topic

At the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 80s, teachers, national school authorities, and the public showed an increased involvement and concern about the rapid development of media and its subsequent consequences for schooling (NOU, 1981:39; St.meld.nr. 62 (82-83); St.meld.nr. 15, (84-85); Den høyere skole, nr. 5, 1973; Norsklæreren nr.4, 1982; Norsk Skoleblad, nr. 15, 19, 23, 1978, nr 28, 1982). Two main questions are raised in the debates: How do schools and the curriculum cope with children's relationship to and use of media, and how do the schools take into use the new technology as a tool in the classroom? In relation to the first question, the arguments for media as a school topic include issues about values and moral. In different documents we can find questions whether the new media situation could be dangerous for the children (Norsk Skoleblad, nr. 9, 15, 1978; nr. 29, 1982, St.meld. nr. 62; NOU,1981:39)). The school has therefore a responsibility to help the children to cope with and to become critical in using media. To do that, teachers in schools need qualification and education in the field. As a response to

this need, a large numbers of seminars and conferences were arranged for teachers at the beginning of the 1980s. Some educational programs in colleges of education were also established. There is a third question related to schooling and media which has been and still is important: Is media going to be a school subject on its own or should it be integrated in already established subjects like Norwegian and social sciences? The debate about which subject it belongs to shows some conflicting views (Norsklæreren nr. 1, 1985; St.meld.nr. 15 p.96-97; RVO 1984), though this debate is not a debate about whether or not media should have place in the curriculum.

When looking through materials from the National School Authorities and from journals we find arguments for the need of education in media at all levels in our educational system. In the documents presented above it is the role of media as a subject in primary to upper secondary school that has been in the focus.

The organization of media and media policy

In 1977 the Government appointed a committee to make recommendations about mass media and media policy. The committee finished their report in 1983 (NOU 1983:3). In the report the committee describes the situation, the role of media and the tasks and functions related to recent technological developments. The focus is on media expansion and the organizational, governmental and financial consequences. At this time there was only one national non-commercial television station (Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation), and there were clear rules about the amount of broadcasting time permitted. The majority of the committee supported the view that the time was not ripe to start developing a second channel. There was, furthermore, strong support for the need of research on media and the report recommended a stronger participation from the universities.

By June 1983, the Government started working with question concerned a second channel. A new committee was established and completed its work in 1985 (NOU:1985:11). In this report, we also find arguments for the need of education and research in media. In the

report to the Storting no. 84 (1984-85) about a new media policy the arguments for research and education in media is however, missing. The Report no 66 (1984-85) about higher education has a chapter about education in media. This report to the Storting states clearly that "fresh" resources from the State to educational programs cannot be expected so that the colleges and the universities will need to reallocate positions and resources.

The documents cited above demonstrate an awareness for the need of knowledge, education and research in the field of media. They contain some interesting shifts of political opinion as regards establishing a second nationalwide television channel. The need for research on media is strong in NOU 1983, and the committee established a subcommittee for research questions, in which one of the central figures in the field of media at the University of Oslo participated. But as mentioned, this interest is not central in the report to the Storting no. 84 (1984-85).

The arguments above are not especially linked to the University of Oslo, but are more concerned about the general need for advancement of knowledge and education.

Let us move to the specific situation at the University of Oslo.

The arguments and motives from actors inside the University of Oslo

In June 1984 the Senate at the University decided to set up an *ad hoc* committee to look at the question of cooperation between the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences in establishing an interdisciplinary educational program in media. When reading the report from this *ad hoc* committee and talking to faculty members, three main groups of arguments emerge.

First, making a policy statement in reply to one important part of the mandate that was given the group from the Senate, this *ad hoc* committee emphasizes the needs of society for advanced knowledge and the need for qualified personnel on graduate level. This can be seen as an important argument from the *ad hoc* committee to legitimate the importance

of establishing an educational program in media at the University of Oslo. In other words, the committee responded to the arguments from the central authority and the public.

Second, the faculty members explore in the interviews that they see the establishment of the department and the educational program as a result of a political discussion on the University and Faculty level. On the one hand, the economic situation at the Faculty of Social Sciences gave no possibility for establishing an educational program on a higher level. The old Institute for Press Research made a proposal at the Faculty of Social Sciences about an educational program on a higher level but did not succeed. On the other hand, the situation in the Faculty of Arts was that, besides having few resources the Faculty had suffered a decrease in student enrolment. So one important political strategy for the Faculty of Arts was to define new areas which would be popular among the students. An educational program in media was supposed to be such a field.

One significant difference between the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences, mentioned by quite a few of the faculty members, was that at the Faculty of Arts the desire to build up an educational program in Media was not simply the wish of a few, it was a part of the policy and the strategy planning of the entire Faculty of Arts. The situation in the Social Sciences was different. The faculty members from the old Institute for Press Research felt that they did not get any support from the Faculty of Social Sciences for developing an educational program on a higher level inside the Faculty of Social Sciences.

The third argument, used by the faculty members, can be seen as a more substantive one. Some of the faculty members from the old Institute for Press Research realized early that humanistic perspectives were lacking in the educational program they had built up. So some were interested in constructing an interdisciplinary educational program. When looking into the report for building up a new educational program in humanistic media, we also find arguments of a more theoretical or substantive character.

In summary, when talking to the faculty members and reading the documents about the establishment of the department and the educational program, there are three main interwoven arguments: the needs of the society, the needs of the University, and the need

for a broader perspective in studying the phenomenon in question. The last argument was accepted, although some staff members the old Institute for Press Research did not agree that establishing a joint educational program between the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Social Sciences was the right thing to do. They wished to build on what was already established at the Faculty of Social Sciences.

According to these arguments, developing a new area cannot be viewed only as a consequence of development of the academic discipline. Development of a new area of study is also an important political process where both the wishes of the society and the institution itself play a major role.

Let me close this section by quoting one of the respondents[6]:

> "It is a paradox that it took the University of Oslo such a long time to develop an educational program [on a higher level] in Media, but that when they first did it, it was and is perceived internationally as a very modern subject which is interdisciplinary and which fits really well with the phenomenon that we are supposed to be investigating".

THE CONTEXT AND THE PROCESS TOWARDS BECOMING A DEPARTMENT

In order to understand the establishment of the new department it is necessary to give some details about the history and to make some comments about the context or the situation at that time at the University of Oslo.

The faculty members at the Institute for Press Research had for many years tried to establish a higher level degree program in media and mass communication, but they had not succeeded. In the early 1980s the Faculty of Arts seriously started the work to establish an educational program. Two committees made two reports and the last one presented an educational program for a lower level degree. This report got support from the Faculty of Arts and was sanctioned by the University. In connection with the formal

support for establishing this new program, the Senate at the University, as already mentioned, decided in June 1984 to set up an interdisciplinary *ad hoc* committee to look at the question of cooperation between the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences. In July 1986 this *ad hoc* committee delivered the report (Ad hoc-utvalg for mediestudier, 1986).

The financial support from the state to the universities started to decrease in the 1970s and this trend continued into the beginning of the 1980s. Student enrolment for subjects in some traditional departments was declining too, like for instance Nordic Studies and History of the Faculty of Arts, and the Institute for Educational Research of the Faculty of Social Sciences.

In 1984 the University at the central level decided, under pressure from the Minstery of Education, to evaluate the use of resources in different departments and in the different faculties in an attempt to move positions (tenured posts) from one department to another and from one faculty to another. This was a new strategy at the University and I will not go into details, but we may conclude that the plan was not very successful (Langfeldt, 1991) . The point here is to show what the economic situation was like for establishing a new educational program. Although there were "bad times" for every one, all places were not hit equally hard.

As already mentioned the faculty members at the old Institute for Press Research had made a request to the Council of the Faculty of Social Sciences for more positions. But so had the other departments at the Faculty - in this competition, the Institute for Press Research did not reach the top of the list. An informant in my interview gives a characteristic of the old Institute's place in the Faculty (6 big departments; Political Sciences, Social Economy, Social Anthropology, Sociology, Educational Research and Psychology).

> "We were always hanging on the tail-end. And the Faculty of Social Sciences thought it had given enough for 25 years, so it was the Faculty of Arts' turn to contribute to the field of media".

The Faculty of Arts was in some ways in a worse situation than the Faculty of Social Sciences, since student enrolment was so low in its big departments. And as already mentioned, one way to increase the enrolment was to establish educational programs in fields which might be popular with students. This was not the main motive for the establishment. As already remarked, there are more substantial reasons or motives from the Faculty of Arts. But it is rather paradoxical that the impending crisis made it possible for the Faculty to allocate resources to a new department. The resource allocation to the new department can be understood as one strategy for the Faculty of Arts to keep its resources and staff tenured positions inside the Faculty.

The biggest problem facing some faculty members was the discussion about establishing an interdisciplinary educational program where the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Social Sciences would be viewed as equals. The decision about one program did not take into consideration that the amount of scientific knowledge and the strength of the research traditions in the field were different. This was the main argument in the dissent written by one of the members of the *ad hoc* committee as part of the report. He argued that there was an impression of equivalence between the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Arts with regard to their professional competence in the field, but that this state of affairs was misleading; there had never existed a complete Media milieu at the Faculty of Arts. The group from the Institute for Press Research argued that they had founded the research tradition. The Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences who also was a member of the *ad hoc* committee, made a critical comment on the dissenting statement in the report. He argued that there was no reason for the different milieus in the Faculty of Arts to wait in establishing an educational program or a field for research merely because the two Faculties might not be on the same level of competence. He stated that building up national research needs researchers from different fields. When looking at the comments from the leader of the Faculty of Social Sciences we can understand the expression in my interviews that the Faculty of Social Sciences did not support the arguments from the Institute for Press Research.

As my data show, it was not only faculty members from the Faculty of Social Sciences

who were sceptical to an interdisciplinary department. The Chairman of the Committee, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts at that time, expressed in the interview that the members of the Faculty Council were very sceptical.

So when starting the discussion about an interdisciplinary department the faculty members from both sides were sceptical, but the Deans of the two Faculties were positive and saw this as the most logical solution. The Dean at the Faculty of Social Sciences stated that the Dean at the Faculty of Arts and himself used their power and position to carry it through and their opinion was shared by the University Senate.

THE SOLUTION

The curriculum

In the first year of the new department the curriculum for the lowest level (foundation course) was not fully integrated. The *ad hoc* committee recommended a model which had one common core section that was compulsory for all the students (at least 50%) and a section where the students could choose between two different specializations: one in the Humanities and one in the Social Sciences. But for the committee the longterm aim was a gradual extension of the common section. The reason for this specialization is obvious. There was a lot of disagreement between the faculty members from the two different Faculties and it would be too much to expect that they would fully accept an integration. So it was important for the different groups to influence the curriculum as far as they could.

But after one year both the students and the faculty members did not find that arrangement satisfactory, so the next year the foundation course ("grunnfag") became fully integrated in the sense that the different specialities were eliminated.
And as most of the faculty members put it, practical reasons and the views of the students were important factors behind the decision to change the syllabus so rapidly.

When trying to understand the development of the curriculum, I will present below some examples on how different faculty members view knowledge, and what they consider counts as knowledge. The faculty members at the Institute for Media and Communication, both the tenured and the non-tenured, are from different disciplines or fields of knowledge: Political Science, Sociology, Education, Nordic Studies, History and Film Science. When talking to them about knowledge they represent different views, both regarding scientific knowledge and ways of gathering and validating knowledge. This is not surprising according to the research literature (Becher, 1989; Biglan, 1973). One of the faculty member, originally from the Faculty of Arts, gave an example of the existence of fundamental differences:

> "... within more so-called positivistic, social disciplines there is a tendency to make a clear separation between theory and method. But from our hermeneutical standpoint they cannot be separated. The method is given by the theory, and one cannot separate the methods from their theoretical foundation."

The faculty members described the differences in various ways, although the division between different opinions did not quite follow the division between the two Faculties.

As a result of these different viewpoints, some of the faculty members stated that they did not look upon the field as a discipline in a traditional way:

> "The object of study - Media - is what unites the different approaches... Accordingly it is the object that unites us and not the theories or methods."

> "It is the theme that is the place of meeting."

For some of the younger research fellows, the different approaches are precisely what makes the field so interesting. "One takes inspiration from a lot of areas. ... there are no boundaries or frames".

One staff member from the Social Sciences Faculty wished that the department would move more in the direction of an integration between the different approaches, "if not in other ways, at least trying to make clear which items we have divergent opinions about".

Another one representing the Arts Faculty stated that there was a sort of agreement to disagree, saying:

> ".....this situation has shaped an agreement to leave the different people and different fields alone and not try to force a sort of a one over-all professional definition onto the different fields".

Quite a few of the faculty members argued that an important aim was to succeed in building a department for teaching and research in Media and Communication. For that purpose, cooperation becomes essential, and a sort of "to be or not to be" for the Institute for Media and Communication.
A member from the Arts Faculty put it this way:

> "We have had cooperation as a superior aim, almost above everything else. We have succeeded to carry out this, and that has had a good effect on the milieu. A negative effect has been the lack of deeper discussions about professional contradictions inevitable in such a complex milieu. At the same time we have had this culture of respecting each other, so one accepts contradictions and professional differences. This tendency makes the professional conflicts fewer, but maybe we now are starting to ask for the discussions because they are so important".

Some, especially from the Social Sciences Faculty, saw the importance of building up a professional identity. One of the faculty members from the Social Sciences who works in the field of Multimedia and Telecommunication also wanted to question the need for the department to cover everything. He said that perhaps the smartest thing to do is to "Stick to what one can do best", in other words not to try to cover all the new media, but do research on the traditional media where the department already has got the competence.

There were no strong expressed opinions about competition between the two main traditions. One of the research fellows from Social Sciences argued that

> "I think if somebody asks the question to day, if the knowledge base for the Institute shall be either the Humanities or the Social Sciences, that is a question which is totally a thing of the past, it is necessary with both".

However, another research fellow from the Social Sciences expressed a comment that shows a concern about the power of the different traditions:

> "What I am a little bit uncertain about is that there is a tendency for the influence from the Humanities to be getting stronger and then it is important to strengthen and develop the influence from the Social Sciences ..."

To sum up, the common view of the field of knowledge expressed is that it is interdisciplinary. There were a great acceptance for the different views and approaches. Further, at this moment when talking about the field of knowledge, there are no strong arguments for trying to limit or close the field. In spite of the major conflict between the faculty members from the two Faculties before the establishment and their unwillingness to cooperate when the institute first was a reality cooperation become very important for all the faculty members. On of the faculty members from the social sciences explained this willingness by saying "If you can't beat them - join them!".

Organization

Another interesting topic is how the organizational location of the department was solved. The *ad hoc* committee recommended a shared solution. The department should be shared equally by the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences. And this was the way it started. The University Senate accepted this as a temporary solution; a solution that they in the end of 1990 decided to prolong for up to five years. However, less than a year later the University wanted to make a final decision and asked the Institute for Media and

Communication to make a choice between the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Arts. When the faculty members were interviewed, some of them stated that the best solution would be to have status as a school of communication and not to be a part of the established Faculties, an argument that is easy to understand when viewing media as an interdisciplinary field of study, but the leadership of the University would not accept such an arrangement. Before making a decision IMK sent a letter to the two Faculties asking the important question about what sort of offer the two Faculties could make. The answers from the two Faculties are different, and when reading them we can see clearly that the Faculty of Arts is offering the most constructive solution, which takes into consideration the special demands from the Institute for Media and Communication. The answer from the Faculty of Social Sciences is also positive, but at the same time much more defensive in the sense that it argues that a lot of the demands from IMK depend on decisions at other levels.

On 22 November, 1992 the Council at IMK decided to choose the Faculty of Arts. The decision was unanimous, but three representatives with their backgrounds from the Faculty of Social Sciences made a written explanation; they held the view that the field of study is closer to the approaches and methods from the Social Sciences, and that research on media in Norway has a much stronger tradition in the Social Sciences than in the Humanities. They find it regrettable that the premises for the debate about the faculty connection have been held on a more practical than substantial level, and that the question concerning the resources has played a too important role. They conclude by arguing for a liaison to the Faculty of Social Sciences, but they did not find it appropriate to table a motion in this regard.

When reading the resolution from IMK it is clear that a pragmatic, practical reason is used for choosing the Faculty of Arts. The most important consideration is that the department in the future should get the possibility to continue as an ordinary university department. The Faculty of Arts is clear on this point, but the Faculty of Social Sciences will not guarantee that IMK will continue as a basic unit.

The decision about organizational "belonging" shows that the placement of a department cannot be understood as a logical consequence of the subject content of the field. It also shows that the organizational structure plays an important role and may make it difficult for interdisciplinary programs to be recognized as interdisciplinary. The faculty structure has been a very stable feature of the University of Oslo. It is impossible at present to estimate what sort of consequences the relationship to only one Faculty will have on the curriculum.

CONCLUSIONS

Let me sum up and make some concluding remarks by returning to the two questions raised at the beginning of this paper.

1. How can we explain the development of educational programs in the universities?

In answering this question I started by presenting some theoretical approaches based on an understanding and an assumption that we have to take both external and internal or cognitive and social dimensions into consideration.

In the empirical case study, important external factors were introduced for understanding the emergence of the Institute for Media and Communication at the University of Oslo. The Government, the Teachers' Unions through their journals, and the public were arguing for the need of education in the field of media because the media exert a strong influence on young people. These arguments are based on ideological and pedagogical considerations. Another line of argument is also seen from the Government and the media organizations: the need for educational training to manage the new technology. Such arguments reflect an administrative use of the knowledge.
The arguments found in political documents are concerned with questions about education generally and not just at the University of Oslo. Still they must be viewed as significant for explaining the emergence of the new program at the University of Oslo. Put together they represent an important societal legitimation.

When shifting focus to the arguments from the actors inside the University there is an important external factor: the economic situation of the University in the period just before the decision about the establishment was taken. As described earlier in this paper, there was a need for more students at the Faculty of Arts if the Faculty was not to lose resources. An educational program in Media and Communication was seen as a solution. This argument was expressed by faculty members in the interviews. The situation at the Faculty of Social Sciences was characterized by no resources at all to put into new fields or in a further expansion of the already established educational courses in media. The leadership at the University regarded media as an important field to develop and supported the arguments from the Faculty of Arts.

It is also necessary to look at more internal arguments or a cognitive legitimation for the development of the educational program. From the Faculty of Arts we can find arguments about how to develop the field of research and the lack of knowledge in the field of media. From some of the faculty members from the Social Sciences there are arguments for expanding the field because of the need for humanistic perspectives in research and education in media. The knowledge traditions - the theoretical and methodological approaches - were seen as too narrow. These arguments can be seen as internal and based on the development inside the knowledge traditions. This debate and discussion are of course part of a larger debate in the international research community of media and communication.

The arguments or explanations stated above serve different interests. The arguments for the establishment of the program can be understood from many angles: the ideological view, the administrative view, the need of keeping resources and finally the more substantial view concerned with the advancement and development of knowledge.

When looking at the relationship between media as a school topic and the development of an educational program at the university level the data support Goodson's (1984, 1988) conclusions. Often the emergence of an academic discipline starts because of a process of aspiration upwards from low status groups. In this study these groups are teachers in compulsory and upper-secondary schools.

When trying to explain the emergence of a school subject Goodson (1988) says:

> The story is not of the translation of an academic discipline, devised by ('dominant') groups of scholars in universities, into a pedagogic version to be used as a school subject. Rather the story unfolds in reverse order and can be seen as a drive on the part of low status groups at school level progressively to colonize areas within the university sector - thereby earning the right for scholars in the new field to define knowledge that could be viewed as a discipline (p. 177).

Nevertheless, in this study the viewpoint is from the university and not from the schools and my data show that at the same time as the teachers started the discussion there was a struggle inside the university for developing an educational program where faculty members from different disciplines and departments played an important role. Instead of viewing the relationship between academic disciplines and school subject as either a process downwards or upwards, the most fruitful perspective would be to see how different actors and groups of actors at different levels and in different disciplines in the educational system participate and cooperate in the process of establishing a new educational program in the university and a new subject in schools.

2. How can we describe the interplay and the relationship between different factors and arguments that influence the processes behind new educational programs?

This question is perhaps more difficult to answer and the theoretical and empirical perspectives in this paper do not intend to give causal explanations. Still I will try to make some concluding remarks from my data about the interplay seen in its contextual frame.

There are two relationships I want to accentuate. The first is concerned with the relationship between the cognitive legitimation or the motives some of the faculty members and also the Deans of the two Faculties expressed on the one side and the financial situation on the other. My data show that it is too simple to explain the development of the Institute of Media and Communication as just a question about how to get or keep resources or in another words just as a question of university politics. It also concerns motives or desires from the researchers in the field to develop a deeper

knowledge about the phenomenon.They also expressed a genuine interest in producing knowledge to meet the societal needs. On the other side the establishment of an interdisciplinary department cannot be understood without looking at the contextual frames. These two discourses, described earlier in this paper, a political discourse and a epistemological discourse, run together and are used at the same time by the same actors. It may also be significant to say that these two discourses are rooted in two different realms of legitimation. The first is rooted in the needs and expectations from the broader society and from the needs of the University, and the individual researcher's possibilities in building up his or her career. The other discourse is rooted more in the development of knowledge itself. It is this discourse that we take part in and is at the forefront, when we discuss research problems at conferences and with colleagues in our own department. I find that the discussions about the need for making demarcation in Media is partly rooted in a epistemological discourse and partly rooted in a political discourse. For instance, the arguments used by the faculty members from the Social Sciences about an interdisciplinary educational program - the need for a humanistic perspective - cannot fully be understood without viewing them from a theoretical point of view. But we also have to look for strategic arguments in trying to understand the resistance from some of the faculty members of Social Sciences against the establishment of an interdisciplinary program that considers the humanistic and social sciences as equal. In this political discourse, the discourse is ruled by arguments about how we can keep the resources and the status of our own perspective in the field and also how we can secure our career prospects in the field (Goodson 1984).

In trying to show the interplay between different factors we should also look at the development of the curriculum and the question about organizational placement of the department. The solution about placing IMK at the Faculty of Arts cannot be explained by looking at internal, cognitive factors. The solution from the University is rooted in administrative arguments to adapt the department to the ordinary organizational structure. In the interviews the faculty members expressed another view based on the nature of knowledge itself. They argued that the educational program and the curriculum was and should be seen as interdisciplinary and that the organizational structure should reflect this interdisciplinarity. But as stated before, it was impossible to build an organization outside

the faculty structure, and they had to choose. The solution is therefore based on pragmatic and practical reasons.

The theoretical approach suggests that educational programs can be viewed as a result of these two discourses and gives a perception of the importance of the interplay and interaction between these to types of discourses. When looking at the data, it is necessary to elaborate further the relationship between the arguments used from different actors and the context they operate in. In the empirical study there are as mentioned above, examples of both epistemological and political arguments, but the data also illustrate that the different arguments are in use in different periods. Accordingly, we have to understand the context in order to understand why some arguments get footing in a certain period. For instance in the beginning of the 1980s faculty members from different department at the Faculty of Arts argued for the need of an educational program by using epistemological arguments and arguments pertaining to the needs of society (both a cognitive and a social legitimation). I will argue that this was an important manifestation of the requirement for an educational program and, subsequently, these arguments become very important for the Faculty of Arts in arguing for using resources and move positions to a new field. The economic context then produced new arguments, the need for keeping resources in the Faculty. The point I want to make is that the relationship between different arguments in my study must be explained by seeing how they operate at different time and how they are related to the context.

The last comment I want to make is on the relationship between knowledge and power. The presentation of the data do not directly show the connection between knowledge and power. But we may assume that by creating a new educational program and a new institutional arrangements for the production of knowledge on the highest level it will have consequences for the established arrangements for the production of knowledge (in schools, in colleges of education, in regional colleges). The education at the university and the scholars inside the new department are on the "top" of the hierarchy in knowledge production and have the power to decide what is valid knowledge. In relationship to the study of the establishment of the Institute for Media and Communication it would be quite interesting to see how they will affect the future school curriculum.

However, it is important to assert that the faculty members are participating in an international epistemological discourse that has a great impact on the research and educational agenda, furthermore, they are also a part of a political discourse on both a institutional, national and international level that influence and affect the content and organization of educational program and also the policy for access to higher education.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Before closing this paper I just want to make some comments on further research. It would be interesting from a curriculum perspective to engage in a follow-up study focusing upon content and changes made in the educational program. The period that I have looked at is too short to perceive the changes. The Institute for Media and Communication has great opportunities to develop its program and extend the bounds of knowledge. There is a lot of challenges as to forms of knowledge in the educational program: the relationship to technological knowledge, to practical knowledge, to traditional scientific knowledge and to the tensions between more traditionally quantitative studies and more qualitative studies. The department has still not established definite knowledge traditions and is therefore compelled to make some choices and decisions it would be worth while to study. And when viewing curriculum as a cultural and social construction discussions about the content of the curriculum will always go on. The Institute for Media and Communication may, following Gumport's argumentation (1988)," *always* be re-visioning knowledge" (p. 234).

1. This paper is part of an ongoing project which focuses on the establishment of new educational programs and the curriculum making processes in higher education. The empirical data are based on two departments at the University of Oslo: The Institute for Media and Communication and the Institute for Nursing Science.

2. By translating the Norwegian term 'studiefag' into English I have chosen 'educational program'. An educational program in a Norwegian university means a program which gives degree courses on all levels, that the education is organized in a department and that the faculty staff both teach and do research.

3. University of Oslo dates back to 1811 when it was founded by the king of Denmark and Norway. Until 1946 it remained the only university in Norway. Today the University has more than 35.000 students attending seven faculties. Like the other Norwegian universities (Tromsø, Trondheim and Bergen) and most institutions of higher education, the University of Oslo is run by the state. What typifies the system of government at the University is the three-tier decision-making process (University, faculty, department) with governing bodies composed of elected members of the academic staff, the technical and administrative staff, and the students. The University is governed by the Senate with an elected Rector as its Chair. The highest body in a faculty is the faculty council with a elected Dean as its Chair. The department is governed by the departmental council and the Chair of the departmental council is the head of department.

4. In this paper 'institute' will be used synonymous with 'department'.

5. In translating the terms used to denote different educational levels I have used the names given in the information pamphlet: Courses offered at the Faculty of Social Science, University of Oslo 1991.

6. These interviews were of course, done in the Norwegian language. Since different views are important in this study, I find it important to express them by quoting the respondents. When translating them into English there is a great danger of changing their meaning. Because of that and my own limitations in doing the translation, I have chosen to pay more attention to the meaning than trying to translate every single word the respondents have used.

References:

Ad hoc-utvalg for mediestudier, 1986: Innstilling, Juli, 1986.Universitetet i Oslo.(Ad hoc Commitee for Media Education, Report July, University of Oslo).

Becher, Tony, 1989: *Academic Tribes and Territories.* Milton Keynes: SRHE and Open University Press

Bernstein, Richard, 1983: *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Biglan, Anthony, 1973: The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas. In *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol.57, no. 3 , p. 195-203.

Böhme. Gernot, 1986: Demarcation as a strategy of exlusion: Philosohers and Sophists. In Bömne, Gernot and Nico Stehr, 1986: *The Knowledge Society*, vol X, p 57-66. Dordrecht: D.Reidel Publishing Company.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1988: *Homo Academicus.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brante, Thomas, 1981: *Vetenskapens struktur och förändring.* (Science: Structure and Change). Karlshamn: Doxa AB

Brante , Thomas, 1987: The Legitimation of New Scientific Fields: The Example of Social Work Research. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Study of Higher Education and Researh, Dalarö, Sweden, June 1 - 5, 1987.

Broady, Donald, 1987: Symbolic Capital, Cultural Capital, Field. Notes on key concepts in Pierre Bourdieu's sociology and their use in research on higher education. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Study of Higher Education and Researh, Dalarö, Sweden, June 1 - 5, 1987.

Cherryholmes, Cleo H.,1988: *Power and Criticism.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cooper, Barry, 1984: On Explaining Change in School Subjects. In Goodson, Ivor F., and Ball, Stephen J. (eds.): *Defining the Curriculum.* London: The Falmer Press, p. 45-63.

Den høyere skole. 1973, nr, 5. (Journal for Upper-Secondary School).

Foucault, Michel, 1979: *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault,Michel, 1980: Truth and Power. In Gordon, Colin (ed.): *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault.* Bringthon: Harvester.

Goodson, Ivor, 1984: Subjects for Study: Towards a Social History of Curriculum. In Goodson, Ivor F., and Ball, Stephen J. (eds.): *Defining the Curriculum*. London: The Falmer Press, p. 25-44.

Goodson, Ivor, 1988: *The Making of Curriculum*. London: The Falmer Press.

Goodson, Ivor, 1990: Læreplanforskning mot ett socialt konstruktivistisk perpektiv. (Curriculum Research: Towards a Social Constructivistic Perspective. In: *Forskning om utbildning* (Research on Education), no.1, p. 4-17.

Gumport, Patricia, 1988: Curricula as Signposts of Cultural Change. In: *Review of Higher Education*, vol. 12 No. 1, p 49- 61.

Gumport, Patricia, 1991: E Pluribus Unum? Academic Structure, Culture, and the Case of Feminist Scholarship. In: *Review of Higher Education*, Vol. 15 No 1, p. 9-29.

Huber, Ludwig, 1990: Disciplinary Culture and Social Reproduction. In: *European Journal of Education*, vol 25, no. 3, 1990.

Jones, Richard, 1990: Educational practices and scientific knowledge. In Ball, Stephen, J (ed.): *Foucault and education*. London: Routledge, p. 78-104.

Kuhn, Thomas, 1970: *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2d. ed.. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, Imre and Musgrave, Alan (ed), 1970: *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Langfeldt, Liv, 1991: *Styringsproblemer i en desentralisert og hetrogen institusjon*. (Problems of governing in a desentralized and hetrogen institution) Universitetet i Oslo: Institutt for statsvitenskap. (University of Oslo: Institute for Policy Science)

Liedman, Sven-Eric and Olausson, Lennart, 1987: General Education, Culture, and Specialization. In *Studies of Higher Education and Research*, 1987:6. Stockholm.

Liedman, Sven-Eric and Olausson, Lennart, 1988 (eds): *Ideologi och institution: om forskning och høgre utbildning 1880 -2000*. (Ideology and Institution: Research and higher education 1880-2000). Stockhom: Carlsson.

Norsklæreren, nr. 4 1982, nr. 1, 1985. (Journal for teachers in Norwegian).

Norsk Skoleblad, nr. 9, 15, 19, 23, 1978, nr. 28, 29, 1982.
(Journal for the Teacher Union)

NOU, 1981:39: *Skolen og lokalsamfunnet* (The school and the local community).

NOU, 1983:3: *Massemedier og mediapolitikk* (Mass Media and Media Policy).

NOU, 1985:11: *TV 2* (About the establishment of a second national televison channel).

Popkewitz, Thomas S, 1991: *A Political Sociology of Educational Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rhoades, Gary and Slaughter, Sheila, 1991: Professors, Administrators, and Patents: The Negotiation of Technology Transfer. In *Sociology of Education*, 1991, Vol. 64 (April):65-77.

Silva, Edward T and Slaughter, Sheila A, 1984: *Serving Power*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Smeby, Jens-Christian, 1992: A cultural Approach to the Study of Academic Disciplines. Paper presented at the National Conference in Sociology "Hermeneutics and Cultural Analysis". Lofoten, Norway, June 17-21, 1992.

St.meld.nr.62 (82-83) *Om grunnskolen* (About Compulsory Education)

St.meld.nr.15 (84-85) *Om videregående opplæring* (About Upper Secondary Education)

St.meld.nr 66 (84-85) *Høyere utdanning* (Higher Education)

St.meld.nr.84 (84-85) *Om ny mediapolitikk* (About Media Policy)

The Faculty of Social Sciences, 1991: Courses offered at the Facutly of Social Sciences, 1991, University of Oslo.

Tierney, William G., 1989: *Curricular Landscapes, Democratic Vistas*. New York: Praeger.

Tierney, William G., 1991: Academic Work and Institutional Culture: Constructing Knowledge. In *The Review of Higher Education* , vol. 14, No. 2, p. 199-216.

Whitley, Richard, 1984: *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wagner, Peter and Wittrock, Björn, 1990: States, Institutions, and Discourses: A comparative Perspective on the Structuration of the Social Sciences. In Wagner, Peter and Wittrock, Björn (eds), 1990: *Discourses on Society: Volum XV*, p 331-357. Dordrecht: D.Reidel Publishing Company.